



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/059,559 | 01/29/2002 | Todd McGee | 38021.010000 | 5781 |

7590 12/29/2005
GREENBERG TRAUIG, P.A.
1221 Brickell Avenue
Miami, FL 33131

EXAMINER

ZEENDER, FLORIAN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/059,559 | Applicant(s) MCGEE, TODD | |
| | Examiner F. Ryan Zeender | Art Unit 3627 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claim 6 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the previously elected invention for the following reasons: It is directed toward a method for buyers and supplier of products/services to engage in electronic commerce.

Applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally elected invention comprising a system for e-commerce. Accordingly, claim 6 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See for example, 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner '311.

Skinner discloses a system for conducting multiple-item (i.e., supply amount) search queries (See for example paragraph 0037, lines 14-16) in a system for engaging in e-commerce; computer hardware, software and storage means containing information regarding suppliers and products available for purchase (See for example paragraphs 0031-0036); servers providing Internet-based access and use of the system (See for example 0023); means for buyers to search for multiple products/services (i.e., multiple amounts of the same product) by entering a single search query (See for example 0037, 0043); means for providing search results whereby the results are grouped (i.e., group of suppliers) and ranked (See for example paragraph 0037 and

Art Unit: 3627

paragraph 0049) by supplier based on which supplier has the greatest capability to supply multiple amounts of product.

Skinner lacks the specific teaching of the search results being ranked by the supplier having inventory for the **greatest number** of queried products/services.

It would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Skinner to have the ranking be for the supplier having inventory for the **greatest number** of queried products/services, as the result for the greatest capability to supply products/services (***as taught by Skinner***) is directly proportional to a result for the greatest number of products/services, and to substitute one type of result for the other would produce similar desired information resulting in a similar final outcome.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner '311 in view of Shavit et al. '156.

Skinner lacks the specific teaching of transmitting RFQ's and receiving responses to RFQ's.

Shavit et al. teach that it is well known in the art to transmit/receive information with respect to RFQ's (See for example Cols. 12-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Skinner et al. to include transmitting RFQ's and receiving responses to RFQ's, in view of Shavit et al., in order to provide on-line interactive sales service (See Shavit et al., lines 45-48).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued that Skinner does not teach: vendor ranking by capability to fill an entire order of multiple different products; and a system for purchasers to search for multiple different products/services via a single search query for the enter multiple product/service order (emphasis added). However, the claims do not specifically state that the products have to be "different" products and therefore, as presently written, the claims are anticipated by Skinner (and Shavit et al.), as discussed in the above rejections.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Ryan Zeender whose telephone number is (571) 272-6790. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alex Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The receptionist's phone number for the Technology center is (571) 272-3600 .

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

F. Zeender
Primary Examiner, A.U. 3627
December 21, 2005

 12/21/05
F. RYAN ZEENDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER